

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

The 4th April, 1978

No. 8/293/78-6HBII. - The Governor of Haryana is pleased to reconstitute the State Family Welfare Committee with the following official and non-officials as its members :—

OFFICIAL MEMBERS

1. Health Minister, Haryana	..	Chairman
2. Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana Health Department	..	Vice-Chairman
3. Director, Health Services, Haryana	..	Member
4. Director, Ayurveda, Haryana	..	Do
5. Regional Director, (Family Welfare and MCH) Regional Health Office, 2057, Sector 15-C, Chandigarh	..	Do
6. Director Public Instruction, Haryana	..	Do
7. Director Public Relations, Haryana	..	Do
8. Principal, Family Welfare Training and Research Centre, Rohtak	..	Do
9. Director of Panchayats, Haryana	..	Do
10. Director, Social Welfare, Haryana	..	Do
11. Labour Commissioner, Haryana	..	Do
12. Deputy Director, Family Welfare, Haryana	..	Member-Secretary
13. Chief Medical Officer, Ambala	..	Member
14. Chief Medical Officer, Jind	..	Do
15. District Family Welfare Officer, Hissar	..	Do
16. District Family Welfare Officer, Ambala	..	Do
17. Lady Doctor Usha Verma, Prof. of Gynaecology Medical College, Rohtak	..	Do

NON-OFFICIAL MEMBERS

1. Master Shiv Parshad, MLA, Ambala.
2. Chaudhri Des Raj MLA, Indiri.
3. Shri Jai Narain MLA, Kalanaur.
4. Chaudhri Karam Singh MLA, Tohana.
5. Dr. Malik Chand Gambhir, Ex-MLA, Yamunanagar
6. Shri Mani Ram Sharma, Advocate, Bhiwani.
7. Ch. Balbir Singh VPO Kanina, District Mahendergarh.

2. The term of the Committee will be for two years in the first instance but the State Government may in their discretion reconstitute it even before the expiry of this term.

3. The State Family Welfare Committee will advise the State Government on the following matters :—

- (i) Research and studies on inter-relationship between economic, social and population change or reproduction pattern attitude and motivation affecting the size of family;

- (ii) Educating public opinion on matters of Family Welfare;
- (iii) Advice and necessary service in Family Welfare as an integral part of the Public Health activities in referral Hospitals, Health Centres and Clinics;
- (iv) Facilities for the Training of personnel in Family Welfare;
- (v) Formation of Schemes for improvement of Health of members and Children and for bringing about better conditions of family living and;
- (vi) Literature and periodicals in furtherance of the objectives of the schemes.

4. The non-official members will draw T. A. according to clause (c) of para 3 of the Haryana Government letter No. 18-PP-A(5)-66/570, dated 23rd November, 1966. The Official members will be entitled to TA/DA as admissible under normal rules.

5. The State Family Welfare Officer will be the Controlling Officer authorised to countersign the TA Bills of the non-official members (including Legislators). The other conditions regarding regulating TA etc. to the members of the Committee will be governed by the conditions incorporated in the letter No. 18-PPA(5)-66/570, dated 23rd November, 1966.

6. The expenditure involved in this connection will be debited to the head "281-Family Welfare-Contingencies (Plan)".

7. This issues with the concurrence of the Finance Department received,—*vide* their U. O. No. 1377-4FDII-78, dated 29th March, 1978.

M. SETH,
Commissioner and Secy.

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 10th April, 1978

No. 3979-3Lab-78/1762.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s T. C. Jain and Sons Jagadhri :—

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 91 of 1975

between

SHRI SUKHARI RAM, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S T. C. JAIN
AND SONS JAGADHRI.

AWARD

By order No. ID/AMB/404-C-75/64316, dated 16th October, 1975, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s T. C. Jain and Sons Jagadhri and its workman Shri Sukhari Ram, to this court, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Sukhari Ram was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

The parties put in their appearance in this Court in response to the usual notices of reference sent to them and filed their pleadings giving rise to the following issues framed,—*vide* order dated 19th July, 1976:—

- (1) Whether the workman had been employed by the management on casual daily payment basis, if yes, to what effect?
- (2) Whether the workman abandoned his job of his own accord?
- (3) In case of non proof of issue No. 2, whether the termination of services of Shri Sukhari Ram was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

The management examined Shri Satish Chand one of their partner who deposed before me on 28th September, 1977 that the workman concerned resigned his job on 7th December, 1974. *vide* resignation Ex. M-1 duly signed by him in his presence at mark A and duly accepted by him (Shri Satish Chand).—*vide* endorsement Ex. M-1/1 in his own hand writing the same day. He added that the workman received Rs. 240 from him as his earned wages of four days on 7th December, 1974 @ Rs. 6 per day in full and final payment of his dues.—*vide* receipt Ex. M-2 signed by him (workman) in his presence.

The management having thus closed their case on 28th September, 1977 on the aforesaid issue the case was adjourned to 27th December, 1977 for recording the rebuttal of the workman who did not summon any witness through court nor himself arranges the appearance of any witness on 27th December, 1977. On a request made by the workman for grant of an adjournment for adducing his rebuttal the case was adjourned to 15th February, 1978 for recording his rebuttal without payment of cost and no witness being present even on 15th February, 1978 it was adjourned to 30th March, 1978 for recording the rebuttal of the workman.

No witness for the workman was present even on 30th March, 1978 and it is significant to note that even though Shri Surinder Kumar had been putting in his appearance in this Court as authorised representative of the workmen since 27th April, 1977, the workman never appeared personally on any of the six or seven hearings of the case since then. In view of these circumstances the evidence of the workman had to be closed,—*vide* my order dated 30th March, 1978 on the ground that he had failed to avail of three opportunities granted to him for adducing his evidence.

It would thus appear that the evidence of Shri Satish Chand and the documents brought on record by him in support of issues No. 1 & 2 remained unrebuted. I have thus no option but to rely on the same under the circumstances of the case stated above. I, accordingly placing full reliance on the statement of Shri Satish Chand and the resignation and the receipt produced by him hold and decide issues No. 1 & 2 in favour of the management.

Issue No. 3:

In view of my findings on issues No. 1 & 2, the workman obviously resigned his job and his services cannot be said to have been terminated by the management and he is thus not entitled to any relief. I, hold and decide this issue accordingly and answer the reference while returning the award in these terms.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 855, dated 5th April, 1978

Dated the 30th March, 1978.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 3978-3Lab-78/1764.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act, No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of the Notified Area Committee Pundri :—

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 102 of 1977

between

SHRI RAM KUMAR V. ALIA, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF THE NOTIFIED AREA COMMITTEE, PUNDRI

AWARD

By order No. 1D/KNL/316-A-77/31761, dated 2nd September 1977 the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of The Notified Area Committee Pundri and its

workman Shri Ram Kumar Walia to this Court for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Kumar Walia was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

The parties put in their appearance in this Court on 22nd November, 1977, in response to the usual notices of reference sent to them.

Whereas Shri M. S. S. Cowshish put in his appearance in this Court on 28th March, 1978 the date of hearing fixed in the case, the management failed to appear on that date despite being directed to do so and file their written statement,—*vide* my order dated 14th February, 1978 with the result that *ex parte* proceedings were taken up against them on the former date.

The workman appearing as his own witness in *ex parte* evidence deposed before me on 30th March, 1978, that the management illegally terminated his services as a Tax Collector on wages of Rs. 337.50 p.m. without serving him any notice or holding an enquiry against him.

I, see no reasons to disbelieve the statement of the workman particularly when the proceedings against the management are *ex parte* and they have taken no care to defend the demand raised on them by the workman concerned relating to his reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages.

I, thus relying on the *ex parte* statement of the workman hold that the termination of his services by the management was unjustified and he is entitled to reinstatement with effect from 12th January, 1977 with continuity of service and full back wages and answer the reference while returning the award in these terms.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Dated the 30th March, 1978.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 894, dated the 5th April, 1978

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 3980-3Lab-78/1766. —In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Amba Woollen Mills, Panipat :—

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, ROHTAK
Reference No. 140 of 1977

between

SHRI BHOLA MEHTA, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S AMBA WOOLLEN MILLS, PANIPAT

AWARD

By order No. ID/KNL/401-77/47684, dated 7th November, 1977, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Amba Woollen Mills, Panipat and its workman Shri Bhola Mehta to this Court for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Bhola Mehta was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

The parties put in their appearance in this Court on 1st February, 1978, in response to the usual notices of reference sent to them and the case was adjourned to 23rd February, 1978, for filing of the written statement by the management of the claim statement of the workman filed on the former date.

Whereas the management put in their appearance before me on 23rd February, 1978, neither the workman nor his authorised representative appeared on that date despite being directed to do so,—vide my order dated 1st February, 1978, with the result that *ex parte* proceedings were taken up against the workman on the former date and the management was asked to adduce their *ex parte* evidence.

Shri Wazir Chand, Store-keeper of the management concerned appearing in *ex parte* evidence deposed that the workman concerned was retrenched from service on 7th July, 1977 on account of shortage of work and that he did not report for duty despite receipt of notice dated 28th December, 1977, Ex. M-1, calling him for that purpose as a result of creation of work necessitating employing more employees. He added that he had received full payment of the retrenchment compensation on 21st July, 1977.

I see no reasons to disbelieve the statement of Wazir Chand particularly when the proceedings against the workman are *ex parte* and he has taken no care to pursue the demand raised by him on the management in respect of his reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages, leading to the reference. I thus relying on the statement of Shri Wazir Chand hold that the termination of services of the workman was justified and in order and he is not entitled to any relief and answer the reference while returning the award in these terms.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Dated the 30th March, 1978.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 896, dated the 5th April, 1978.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 3715-3Lab-78/1770.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Springs and Stampings Incorporated, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Misc. Application No. 6 of 1977 in reference No. 251 of 1971

between

SHRI RAM LAL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S SPRINGS AND STAMPING INCORPORATED, FARIDABAD

AWARD

The management concerned made an application dated 7th March, 1977, through their authorised representative Shri A. R. Handa for setting aside the *ex parte* award dated 2nd February, 1977, directing the reinstatement of the workman concerned with effect from 24th May, 1971, with continuity of service and full back wages on the ground that the latter reached the court a little late on 12th January, 1977, after *ex parte* proceedings were taken up against them on the same day when even the workman did not put in his appearance.

Notices of this application having been sent to the workman concerned, he put in his appearance through Shri Roshan Lal, his authorised representative, on 10th May, 1977, when he was directed to file the reply of the application of the management brought by them for setting aside the *ex parte* award on 13th July, 1971, the next date of hearing fixed in the case. He and his authorised representative, however, failed to appear on 13th July, 1977, despite being directed to do so and file the reply,—vide order

dated 10th May, 1977, with the result that *ex parte* proceedings were taken up against the workman and the management were directed to adduce their *ex parte* evidence. It was considered proper to issue notices of the application to the workman again and it is significant to note that he failed to appear even on 11th January, 1978, despite being duly served with the same through registered post.

Shri K. P. Aggarwal, authorised representative of the management, made an *ex parte* statement on 11th January, 1978, that the workman concerned had received a sum of Rs. 35.64 at balance of his wages of the month of May, 1971 and Rs. 44.25 as his earned leave wages of 11½ days, *vide* voucher Ex. M-1 and M-2 respectively in full satisfaction of the demand raised by him on the management leading to the reference, in pursuance of a settlement copy Ex. M-3, dated 16th September, 1976, duly executed by the parties and that the demand had been thus fully satisfied.

I see no reasons to disbelieve the statement of Shri K. P. Aggarwal referred to above particularly when the workman concerned did not care to defend the application of the management and pursue his demand leading to the reference, despite two opportunities being given to him in this connection, and the same stands further corroborated, *vide* documentary evidence consisting of the vouchers M-1 and M-2 and the settlement Exhibit M-3.

I therefore, relying on the statement of Shri K. P. Aggarwal and the documentary evidence referred to above, set aside the *ex parte* award, dated 2nd February, 1977 and hold that the demand of the workman leading to the reference has been fully satisfied and there is now no dispute between the parties requiring adjudication. I accordingly answer the reference while returning the modified award made in supersession of the *ex parte* award, dated 2nd February, 1977.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

Dated the 21st March, 1978.

No. 790, dated 27th March, 1978

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, in supersession of *ex parte* award, dated 2nd February, 1977 forwarded,—*vide* endorsement No. 223, dated 3rd February, 1977, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 21st March, 1978.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 3976-3Lab-78/1772.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Basai Potteries, Gurgaon.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 71 of 1977

between

SHRI LAL CHAND, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S BASAI POTTERIES, GURGAON

AWARD

By order No. ID/GG/212-A-77/23606, dated 17th June, 1977, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Basai Potteries, Gurgaon, and its workman Shri Lal Chand, to this Court, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Lal Chand was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

The parties put in their appearance in this Court in response to the usual notices of reference sent to them and filed their pleadings.

The workman alleged,—*vide* claim statement filed by him in conformity with the notice of demand served by him on the management concerned that the later terminated his services with effect from 12th November, 1976, illegally and unjustifiably without serving him any notice, in order to victimise him for his trade union activities and that he was entitled to reinstatement with continuity of services and full back wages. He alleged that he was drawing Rs. 165 p. m. as a permanent employee of the management concerned on 12th November, 1976, the date of termination of his services.

The management concerned while admitting the allegations that the workman concerned was in their employment on wages of Rs. 165 p. m. denied other allegations,—*vide* written statement filed by them and pleaded that the workman concerned in fact absented himself from duty without their prior permission and without sanction of leave with effect from 12th October, 1976 and continued to do so till 2nd November, 1976 when they struck off his name from the rolls of their employees as a result of his long continued absence and voluntary abandonment of the job by him in that manner. They raised a preliminary objection that the workman failed to serve on them a notice of demand before approaching the appropriate Government and the reference was thus bad in law and liable to be quashed on that ground alone.

The following issues were thus framed by me on pleas of the parties,—*vide* order, dated 25th October, 1977:—

1. Whether the reference is bad in law for the preliminary objections stated in the written statement?
2. Whether the workman abandoned his job by way of absenting himself from duties from 12th October, 1976 to 2nd November, 1976?
3. If not, whether the termination of services of Shri Lal Chand was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

I have heard learned authorised representatives of the parties with reference to the evidence led by them and seen the records. I, decide the issues as under:—

Issue No. 1.—

The management led no evidence in support of this issue and their authorised representative did not press the same at the stage of arguments. I, thus decide this issue against the management.

Issue No. 2.—

The management examined one Shri Chiranji Lal Gupta, their managing partner, who deposed with reference to the register of attendance of their employees of the period from May, 1976 till date brought by him in Court that Shri Lal Chand, workman concerned, absented himself from duty with effect from 12th October, 1976 and continued to do so till 2nd November, 1976 and he was as such marked absent in the register of attendance during these days and that a letter dated 18th October, 1976, copy Ex. M-2, sent to him by post asking him to resume his duties before 28th October, 1976 and explain reasons of his absence and informing him that in case of his failure to join duties on or before 28th October, 1976, he shall be deemed to have abandoned his job, remained unreprieved. He added that on the workman not reporting himself for assignment of duties on or before 28th October, 1976, despite their having sent him the letter, copy Ex. M-2, referred to above, the management again sent him a letter, dated 2nd November, 1976, through registered post informing him that his name had been struck off the rolls of their employees with effect from the aforesaid date. He brought on record the copy of the letter, dated 2nd November, 1976, Ex. M-3 and the postal receipt, Ex. M-4 and gave out that the copy Ex. M-3 bore his signatures and that they did not receive any reply even of the letter copy Ex. M-3 from the workman concerned. He denied the suggestion that the workman went on sanctioned leave from 12th October, 1976 onwards for 15 days or that he sent any medical certificate relating to his illness through post with a request in writing for extension of his leave by another 15 days or that he ever reported himself for assignment of duties to the management concerned on 10th November, 1976.

Shri Lal Chand, workman, appearing as his own witness reiterated the suggestions made by him in cross-examination of Shri Chiranji Lal, managing partner, that he was sanctioned leave for 15 days from 12th October, 1976, onwards and that he applied for extension of leave on medical ground and reported for assignment of duties to the management concerned on 10th November, 1976. He admitted that the factum of sanction of his leave from 12th October, 1976, to 24th October, 1976 was intimated to him verbally before his leaving Gurgaon for his village. He could not produce the receipt of the application alleged to have been made by him for sanction of leave or a copy of such an application. He produced the postal receipt, Ex. W-2, allegedly in respect of an application sent by him for extension of his leave from 24th October, 1976 to 10th November, 1976, *vide*

registered post and gave out that he did not receive any letter from the management in reply and that he reached Gurgaon on 10th November, 1976 and reported himself to the management for assignment of duties. He set up a case that he actually attended his duties on 11th November, 1976 and in the first half day of 12th November, 1976, when one Shri Kishan Dev asked him to leave the premises of the factory and turned him out thereof without assigning any reasons.

I have fully considered the plea of the workman concerned and the statement made by him and the documents brought on record at his instance. Despite efforts to make out the date of the postal receipt, Ex. W-2, it could not be well deciphered and at best could be read as of the year 1975 well rebutting the statement of the workman that it related to his application for extension of his leave sent by him in November, 1976. The duplicate of the medical certificate alleged to have been obtained by the workman concerned and attached with the application of extension of leave Exhibit W-1/B disclosed that he obtained the original medical certificate on 10th November, 1976, from a Medical Practitioner of Patna and that he was actually under medical treatment during the period from 24th October, 1976 to 10th November, 1976. Now could he personally report himself for assignment of duties to the management concerned on 10th November, 1976, at Gurgaon when he was receiving treatment on that date at Patna from a Medical Practitioner is really understandable. The case put forth by him, —vide his statement that he actually reported himself to the management concerned for assignment of duties on 10th November, 1976 and actually attended his duties on 11th November, 1976 and on first half day of 12th November, 1976, is obviously inconsistent with the case set up by him that he received medical treatment during the period from 24th October, 1976 to 10th November, 1976 and considered from any angle the story put forth by him is false and fabricated. In fact there is no cogent, reliable or trustworthy evidence on record that he was ever sanctioned leave of the period from 12th October, 1976 to 24th October, 1976 or that he ever applied for extension of leave on medical ground of the period from 25th October, 1976, to 10th November, 1976 and the postal receipt Exhibit W-2 produced by him does not support his case in the connection. The evidence of Shri Charanji Lal Gupta, Managing Partner referred to above in detail is on the other hand convincing and reliable and is otherwise found well supported by the documents Exhibit M-1 to M-4. I, thus relying on the statement of Shri Charanji Lal Gupta and the documents M-1 to M-4 and disbelieving the statement of Shri Lal Chand, workman, and the story put forth by him, decide this issue in favour of the management.

Issue No. 3.

In view of my findings on issue No. 2 that the workman concerned himself abandoned his job by way of his voluntary absence from duty during the period from 12th October, 1976 to 2nd November, 1976, it cannot be said that the management ever terminated his services. He is obviously not entitled to any relief. I decide the issue accordingly and answer the reference while returning the award in these terms.

Dated the 30th March, 1978.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

—
No. 892, dated the 5th April, 1978.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 3977-3Lab-78/1774.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Pipe Construction Co. Rampur Sewri, Tehsil Kalka, District Ambala.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, ROHTAK.

Reference No. 137 of 1977

between

SHRI GULAB WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. PIPE CONSTRUCTION
CO., RAMPUR SEWRI, TEHSIL KALKA, DISTRICT AMBALA.

AWARD

By order No. ID/AMB/424-77/49922, dated 27th October, 1977, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Pipe Construction Co., Rampur Sewri, Tehsil Kalka, District Ambala and its workman Shri Gulab, to this Court, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of Services of Shri Gulab was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

The parties put in their appearance in this Court in response to the usual notices of reference sent to them and made their statements before me on 23rd March, 1978 at Ambala Cantt in accordance with the mutual amicable settlement arrived at between them whereby the management agreed to reinstate the workman concerned with continuity of service with effect from 26th August, 1977 and pay Rs 50 as costs of the reference to him and the later agreed to forego his back wages from 26th August, 1977 the date of termination of his services till the date of his actual reinstatement.

It would thus appear that the demand of the workman raised by him on the management concerned leading to the reference stands settled and there is now no dispute between the parties requiring adjudication. I, thus answer the reference while returning the award in terms of the settlement arrived at between the parties in the manner as referred to above.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Dated the 30th March, 1978.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 893, dated 5th April, 1978

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

—
G. V. GUPTA, Secy.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT

The 11th April, 1978

No. 1093 AR(5)-78/10560.—In pursuance of the provisions of paragraph 8 of the Haryana Utilization of Surplus and Other Areas Scheme, 1976, the Governor of Haryana hereby nominates Shri Bishan Singh, Advocate, village Tiontha, tehsil Kaithal as a non-official for the areas of tehsil Kaithal District Kurukshetra).

P. P. CAPRIHAN, Secy.

राजस्व विभाग

युद्ध जागीर

दिनांक 5 अप्रैल, 1978

क्रमांक 425ज(II)-78/9946 --श्री भोला राम, पुरा श्री खाई, गांव खेड़की, दोला तहसील व ज़िला गुडगांवा, को दिनांक 5 दिसम्बर, 1976, को दृष्टि मूल्य के परिणामस्वरूप हरियाणा के राज्यपाल, पूर्वी पंजाब मुद्रा पुरस्कार अधिनियम, 1948 (जैसा कि उसे हरियाणा राज्य में अपनाया गया है और उस में आज तक संशोधन किया गया है) की धारा 4 एवं 2(ए)(1) तथा 3(1) के अधीन प्रदान की गई अक्षितयों का प्रयोग करने हुए महर्ष आदेश देते हैं, कि श्री भोला राम को मुद्रित 150 रु. वार्षिक की जागीर जो उसे हरियाणा गवर्नर की अधिमूलना क्रमांक 2918ज(II)-75/35526, दिनांक 2 दिसम्बर, 1975 द्वारा मनूर की गई थी, अब उसे जिवान श्रीमती नान्ही के नाम खरोड़, 1977 से 150 रु. वार्षिक की दर से सनद में श्री गई शर्तों के अन्तर्गत तहसील की जाती है।